

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Weshington, D.C. 20231

Rame of			Address COMMISSIONER O Washington, D.C. 20 www.uspto.gov	F PATENTS AND TRADEMARK 1231	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/535,233	03/24/2000	Masaya Kadono	SEL (71	1670	
7590 07/05/2002					
Cook Alex McFarron Manzo Cummings & Mehler Ltd			EXAMINER		
200 West Adams Street Suite 2850			COLEMAN, WILLIAM D		
Chicago, IL 60	1606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2823		
			DATE MAILED: 07/05/20	002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					,
Offic			Application No.	Applicant(s)	
			09/535,233	KADONO ET AL.	
		Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
			W. David Coleman	2823	
Period fo		LING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address	
THE I - Exter - efter - if NO - Failu - Any r	MAILING D nsions of time n SIX (6) MONTH period for reply period for reply re to reply withing reply received b	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  The smalling date the provisions of 37 CF.  The from the mailing date of this communication or specified above is less than thirty (30) days, it is specified above, the maximum statutory per in the set or extended period for reply will, by so	R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be	timely filed  flays will be considered timely.  on the mailing date of this communication  NED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	ı.
1)⊠	Responsi	ive to communication(s) filed on	06 June 2002 .		
2a)□	This action	on is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
3)□	closed in	accordance with the practice un	lowance except for formal matters, der Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,		s
Dispositi	on of Clai	ms			
		11-30 is/are pending in the applic			
		above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.		
		is/are allowed.			
	–	1-30 is/are rejected.			
		is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) _ on Papers	are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.		
9) 🔲 .	The specifi	cation is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10) 🔲 🗆	The drawin	g(s) filed on is/are: a) 🗌 a	ccepted or b) objected to by the Ex	raminer.	
	Applicant	may not request that any objection t	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) 🔲 🛚	The propos	ed drawing correction filed on _	is: a)□ approved b)□ disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
		d, corrected drawings are required in	• •		
12) 🔲 🧵	The oath or	r declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
riority u	ınder 35 U	.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
			eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[	⊠ All b)□	] Some * c)☐ None of:			
		tified copies of the priority docum			
			nents have been received in Applica		
		application from the International	priority documents have been recei Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). Iist of the certified copies not receive	•	
14) 🗌 A	cknowledg	ment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	e) (to a provisional application	on).
			provisional application has been renestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 12		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 14.

Attachment(s)

Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
 Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 Other.

Application/Control Number: 09/535,233 Page 2

Art Unit: 2823

## DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 6, 2002 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
  obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al.,
   U.S. Patent 6,123,865 in view of Muraoka et al., U.S. Patent 4,339,340.
- 4. Pertaining to claims 11 and 15, <u>Lin</u> discloses a semiconductor process as claimed. See FIG. 1 where <u>Lin</u> teaches a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device, comprising steps of:

forming a semiconductor film formed over a substrate 10;

spinning the substrate (column 1, lines 40-41);

contact an etching solution to a surface of said semiconductor film and scattering the etching solution during said spinning, thereby contaminating impurities are removed from the surface (etch products are removed, column 1, line 40). However, Lin fails to teach forming a

gate insulating film after performing a spin etch of the semiconductor film of which the contaminating impurity has been removed. Muraoka teaches the removal of contaminants deposited on the surface of intermediate semiconductor products (see Abstract, second sentence). In view of Muraoka, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the intermediate steps of Muraoka into the Lin semiconductor process because the treatment of a silicon wafer with an oxidizing acid results in the formation of a very thin oxide film on the surface of the wafer.

- 5. Pertaining to claims 14 and 16, Lin teaches wherein the contaminating impurity is removed by an acidic solution containing fluorine (hydrofluoric acid, column 2, lines 34).
- 6. Claims 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al., U.S. Patent 6,123,865 in view of Muraoka et al., U.S. Patent 4,339,340 as applied to claims 11 and 14 above, and further in view of Araujo et al., U.S. Patent 5,578,103.
- 7. The combined teachings discloses a semiconductor process substantially as claimed as discussed above. However, Lin in view of Muraoka fails to teach wherein the contaminating impurity element is at least selected from periodic table group I or periodic table group II consisting of Na, K, Mg, Ca and Ba. Araujo teaches wherein the contaminating impurity element is selected from periodic table group I. See column 2 of Araujo where sodium (Na) is taught as a contaminating impurity element from periodic table group I. In view of Araujo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the claimed contamination into the combined teaching process because sodium is a contaminating impurity from periodic table group I because sodium ions at the glass surface exchanged for hydrogen ions contaminate the liquid crystal (column 1, lines 34-35).

Application/Control Number: 09/535,233

Art Unit: 2823

 Claims 19, 20, 23, 24, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al., U.S. Patent 6,123,865 in view of Muraoka et al., U.S. Patent 4,339,340 and Yoshikawa et al., U.S. Patent 6,106,907.

9. Pertaining to claims 19, 23 and 27, <u>Lin</u> discloses a semiconductor process substantially as claimed. See FIG. 1 where <u>Lin</u> teaches a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device, comprising steps of:

Page 4

forming a semiconductor film formed over a substrate 10;

spinning the substrate (column 1, lines 40-41);

contact an etching solution to a surface of said semiconductor film and scattering the etching solution during said spinning, thereby contaminating impurities are removed from the surface (etch products are removed, column 1, line 40). Please note that polysilicon is a crystallized semiconductor film. However, <u>Lin</u> fails to teach forming a gate insulating film after performing a spin etch of the semiconductor film of which the contaminating impurity has been removed. <u>Muraoka</u> teaches the removal of contaminants deposited on the surface of intermediate semiconductor products (see Abstract, second sentence). In view of <u>Muraoka</u>, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the intermediate steps of <u>Muraoka</u> into the <u>Lin</u> semiconductor process because the treatment of a silicon wafer with an oxidizing acid results in the formation of a very thin oxide film on the surface of the wafer. Please note that gate electrodes are inherent in the formation of an electrode (usually called "gate electrode") are one of the fundamental parts of a MOS system as disclosed by Muraoka (column 1, line 53). Yoshikawa teaches that the electrode layer can be the gate wiring layer. See FIG. 7, where

Art Unit: 2823

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the gate wiring layers of Yoshikawa into the combined teachings of Lin and Muraoka because a liquid crystal device with metal electrodes can be formed with good adhesion (see Abstract of Yoshikawa, last sentence).

- Pertaining to claims to claims 20, 24 and 28, Lin teaches wherein the contaminating impurity is removed by an acidic solution containing fluorine (hydrofluoric acid, column 2, lines 34).
- 11. Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al., U.S. Patent 6,123,865 in view of Muraoka et al., U.S. Patent 4,339,340 and Yoshikawa et al., U.S. Patent 6,106,907 as applied to claims 19, 20, 23, 24, 27 and 28 above, and further in view of Araujo et al., U.S. Patent 5,578,103.
- 12. The combined teachings discloses a semiconductor process substantially as claimed as discussed above. However, Lin in view of Muraoka fails to teach wherein the contaminating impurity element is at least selected from periodic table group I or periodic table group II consisting of Na, K, Mg, Ca and Ba. Araujo teaches wherein the contaminating impurity element is selected from periodic table group I. See column 2 of Araujo where sodium (Na) is taught as a contaminating impurity element from periodic table group I. In view of Araujo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the claimed contamination into the combined teaching process because sodium is a contaminating impurity from periodic table group I because sodium ions at the glass surface exchanged for hydrogen ions contaminate the liquid crystal (column 1, lines 34-35).

Art Unit: 2823

## Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. David Coleman whose telephone number is 703-305-0004. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on 703-308-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

W. David Coleman Examiner

Art Unit 2823

WDC

June 28, 2002